arXiv:astro-ph/9907218v1 16 Jul 1999

Off-axis Emission from the Beamed Afterglow of Gamma Ray Bursts and a Possible Interpretation of Slowly Declining X-Ray Afterglow of GRB980425

Takashi Nakamura
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606

ABSTRACT

A formula for off-axis emissions from the beamed afterglow of GRBs in a synchrotron model is derived. The formula is applied to an inhomogeneous circumstellar matter obeying $n \propto r^{-2}$ suggested for SN1998bw/GRB980425. The slow decline rate as well as the X-ray flux similar to the observed values are obtained for appropriate choice of the parameters so that the association of GRB980425 with SN1998bw is further strengthened.

(ApJ Letter in press)

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts—stars: supernovae

1. Introduction

Recently the X-ray light curve of GRB980425 and follow up data obtained by the BeppoSAX have been reported (Pian *et al.* 1999). The NFI observation identified an X-Ray source (S1) position-ally coincident with the unusual Type Ic supernova SN1998bw (Galama *et al.* 1998, Kulkarni *et al.* 1998). Note here that the position of S1 is revised and the other source S2 is $\sim 4'$ away from SN1998bw. The X-ray flux of S1 was 3×10^{-13}erg s^{-1}cm^{-2} in April 26 and declined a factor of two in six months. If this is an X-ray afterglow of GRB980425, the decline rate ($\sim t^{-0.2}$) is extremely slower than usual, which needs an interpretation. If GRB980425 is associated with SN1998bw, the distance is $\sim$ 40Mpc (Galama *et al.* 1998) and the isotropic gamma ray total energy is unusually low $\sim 10^{48}$erg compared with $> 10^{51}$erg in other GRBs for which a redshift measurement is available.

Such a low gamma ray luminosity might be interpreted if the beam direction of GRB980425 is different from the line of sight(Nakamura 1998, Eichler & Levinson 1998). In such an geometry we see only scattered gamma rays so that the luminosity is low and the energy of gamma rays is not high $<$ 500keV (Nakamura 1998, Eichler & Levinson 1998). This also interprets the fact that GRB980425 belongs to so called Non High Energy class of GRBs (Pendelton *et al.* 1997). It is shown that if the angle between the beam and the line of sight is $\sim 30^\circ$, the luminosity can be $\sim 10^{-3}$ smaller than usual (Eichler & Levinson 1998). Such a beam model is relevant now since an evidence for the beaming has recently been suggested from the rapid decline of optical afterglow

of GRB990123 after day 2 (Kulkarni *et al.* 1999) and the rapid decline of GRB980519(Halpern, Kemp, Piran & Bershady 1999).

An angle of $\sim 30^\circ$ has also been suggested to interpret the linear optical polarization ($\sim$0.5% in June 20 $\sim$ 23; Kay, Halpern & Leighly, 1998) of SN1998bw . If the supernova ejecta is an oblate or a prolate shape with an aspect ratio $1:2 \sim 3$ and the line of sight is $\sim 30^\circ$ away from the symmetry axis, the observed linear polarization degree might be explained (Hoeflich, Wheeler & Wang 1998).

From the radio observation of SN1998bw it is suggested that the density distribution of the circumstellar matter follows $n = n_0 r_0^2/r^2$ with $n_0 r_0^2 \sim 10^{34}$/cm, which is consistent with the constant mass loss rate in the progenitor(Li & Chevalier 1999). It is also claimed that the energy of the order of 10^{50}erg should be injected twice with the injection velocity of the order of 0.5c, which strengthens the link between SN1998bw and GRB980425.

In this Letter we try to interpret the slowly declining X-ray afterglow of GRB980425 in the beam model of GRBs assuming the line of sight is $\sim 30^\circ$ away from the axis of the beam. We adopt the density distribution of the circumstellar matter suggested by Li & Chevalier 1999. We will obtain the decline rate and the X-ray flux similar to the observed values for appropriate choice of the parameters so that the association of GRB980425 with SN1998bw will be further strengthened.

2. Off-axis emission from the beamed afterglow

Granot, Piran & Sari 1998 as well as Woods & Loeb 1999 derived a general formula to compute the off-axis emission from beamed GRBs. Here we adopt their formulations and notations. Let us use a spherical coordinate system $\mathbf{r} = (r, \theta, \phi)$ where the coordinate are measured in the lab frame; let the $\theta = 0$ axis (z-axis) points to the detector and $\mathbf{r} = 0$ be the central engine. Let also D be the distance to the source and $\alpha = r \sin\theta / D$ be the angle that a given ray makes with the normal to the detector. Then the observed flux is given by

$$F_\nu(T) = \frac{\nu D}{\gamma\beta} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int_0^{\alpha_m} \alpha^2 d\alpha \int_{\nu\gamma(1-\beta)}^{\nu\gamma(1+\beta)} \frac{d\nu'}{\nu'^2} \frac{j'_{\nu'}[\Omega', \mathbf{r}, T + \frac{r\mu}{c}]}{\{1-\mu^2\}^{3/2}}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mu = (1 - \nu'/\gamma\nu)/\beta$. α_m, T and $j'_{\nu'}$ are the maximum value of α, the arrival time of a photon at the detector and the rest frame emissivity measured in erg s^{-1} cm^{-3} Hz^{-1} sr^{-1}, respectively. Note here that $'$ means the physical quantity in the rest frame.

We adopt the standard fire ball model(Piran 1998). As an emissivity we extend a simple synchrotron model(Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998) used in a homogeneous ambient gas to the inhomogeneous circumstellar matter following $n = n_0 (r/r_0)^{-d}$. d=2 corresponds to the constant mass loss from the progenitor of GRBs. This kind of a model has ever been studied in a different context (Meszaros, Rees & Wijers 1998).

We assume that electrons are accelerated in the shock to a power-law distribution of Lorenz factor γ_e with a minimum Lorenz factor γ_m: $N(\gamma_e) \propto \gamma_e^{-p} d\gamma_e, \gamma_e > \gamma_m$. $\gamma_m = G\gamma$ where γ is the Lorenz factor of the shocked fluid and $G = \epsilon_e(p-2)/(p-1)m_p/m_e$ with ϵ_e being the efficiency of the acceleration. Since $p = 2 \sim 2.5$ is suggested from observations, $G = 60(\epsilon_e/0.1)(3(p-2)/(p-1))$. The magnetic field strength is given as $B = B_0\gamma(r/r_0)^{-d/2}$ where $B_0 = \sqrt{32\pi m_p n_0 \epsilon_B}$. ϵ_B measures the ratio of the magnetic field energy to the total thermal energy. The rest frame radiation power (P') and the characteristic synchrotron frequency ($\nu'(\gamma_e)$) from a randomly oriented electron with Lorenz factor $\gamma_e \gg 1$ in a magnetic field B are given by $P' = P_0\gamma^2\gamma_e^2(r/r_0)^{-d}$ and $\nu'(\gamma_e) = \nu_0\gamma\gamma_e^2(r/r_0)^{-d/2}$ where $P_0 = \sigma_T B_0^2 c/6\pi$ and $\nu_0 = eB_0/2\pi m_e c = 3.5 \times 10^5 \mathrm{Hz}(n_0/1\mathrm{cm}^{-3})^{1/2}(\epsilon_B/0.1)^{1/2}$.

The peak spectral power flux does not depend on γ_e and occurs at $\nu'(\gamma_e)$ and is given by $P'_{\nu',\max} = P'/\nu' = P_0\gamma/\nu_0(r/r_0)^{-d/2}$. The critical gamma factor γ_c is defined by $\gamma_c m_e c^2 = P'(\gamma_c)\tau = P'(\gamma_c)r/(\gamma c)$ and is given by $\gamma_c = F/\gamma(r/r_0)^{d-1}$ where $F = m_e c^3/P_0 r_0$. Then the energy spectra depend on two frequencies defined by $\nu'_m \equiv \nu'(\gamma_m) = \nu_0 G^2\gamma^3(r/r_0)^{-d/2}$ and $\nu'_c \equiv \nu'(\gamma_c) = \nu_0 F^2\gamma^{-1}(r/r_0)^{3d/2-2}$ (Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998) .

There are two different cases in the energy spectra depending on whether $\nu'_m > \nu'_c$ (*fast cooling*) or $\nu'_m < \nu'_c$ (*slow cooling*);(Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998). In both cases the emissivity $j'_{\nu'}$ is expressed in the form as

$$j'_{\nu'} = P'_{\nu',\max}\frac{\gamma n_0}{4\pi}(\frac{r}{r_0})^{-d} f(\nu'), \tag{2}$$

where $f(\nu')$ is given for *fast cooling* case as

$$f(\nu') = \begin{cases} (\nu'/\nu'_c)^{1/3} & \nu'_c > \nu' \\ (\nu'/\nu'_c)^{-1/2} & \nu'_m > \nu' > \nu'_c \\ (\nu'_m/\nu'_c)^{-1/2}(\nu'/\nu'_m)^{-p/2} & \nu' > \nu'_m, \end{cases}$$

while for *slow cooling* case we have a smilar formula(Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998).

Let $\Delta\theta$ and θ_v be the beaming half-angle and the angle between the direction to the detector and the axis of the emission cone. In case of $\theta_v = 0$, Eq. (1) is evaluated as

$$F_\nu(T) = \frac{r^3 n_0}{3D^2\beta}(\frac{r}{r_0})^{-d} I; \quad I = \int_{\nu\gamma(1-\beta)}^{\nu\gamma(1-\beta\cos\Delta\theta)} \frac{\nu d\nu'}{2\nu'^2} P'_{\nu',\max} f(\nu'). \tag{3}$$

For $\gamma \gg 1$ and $\Delta\theta < 1$, the integral is expressed as

$$I = \int_1^{\gamma^2\Delta\theta^2} \frac{ds}{s^2}\gamma P'_{\nu',\max} f(\nu\gamma s/2). \tag{4}$$

If $\gamma\Delta\theta \gg 1$, I does not depend on $\Delta\theta$. This is expected since in this case the detector detects the radiation only from the half-angle of γ^{-1} and can not observe the edge of the beam. For $d = 0$, Eq. (4) gives the same results as in Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998. [1]

[1]In reality there is 10% or so difference depending on the parameter p. However such a difference is consistent in a simple model of emissivity in Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998.

Now let us consider another extreme case of $1 > \theta_v > \Delta\theta > \gamma^{-1}$. In this case the line of sight from $\mathbf{r} = 0$ does not pass through the beam. Then Eq. (1) is evaluated as

$$F_\nu(T) = \frac{r_0^3 n_0 P_0}{12\pi D^2 \nu_0}(\frac{r}{r_0})^{3(2-d)/2} I; \quad I = \int_{\nu\gamma(1-\beta\cos(\theta_v+\Delta\theta))}^{\nu\gamma(1-\beta\cos(\theta_v-\Delta\theta))} 2\phi_v \frac{\gamma\nu d\nu'}{\nu'^2} f(\nu'), \tag{5}$$

where $\cos\phi_v = (\cos\Delta\theta - \cos\theta\cos\theta_v)/\sin\theta_v\sin\theta$.

Eq.(5) is a general formula for off-axis emission from beamed GRBs in a synchrotron model. In the next section we shall apply the formula to GRB980425.

3. Application to GRB980425

Now let us consider d=2 case which is suggested from SN1998bw (Li & Chevalier 1999). Then Eq. (5) is rewritten as

$$F_\nu(T) = \frac{r_0^3 n_0 P_0}{12\pi D^2 \nu_0} I; \quad I = \int_{(1-\beta\cos(\theta_v+\Delta\theta))}^{(1-\beta\cos(\theta_v-\Delta\theta))} 2\phi_v \frac{ds}{s^2} f(\nu\gamma s). \tag{6}$$

The position of the shock is related to the arrival time T as $r = cT/(1-\beta\cos\theta_v) \sim 1.9\times10^{16}\mathrm{cm}(\theta_v/30^\circ)^{-2}T_d$ where T_d is the arrival time in days. γ is given for the adiabatic case by

$$\gamma = (\frac{E_b}{m_p c^2 n_0 r_0^2 r 2\pi\Delta\theta^2})^{1/2} = 63(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{1/2}(\frac{1-\beta\cos\theta_v}{\Delta\theta^2})^{1/2}(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{-1/2}(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{-1}T_d^{-1/2}, \tag{7}$$

where E_b is the total energy in the beam.

The two characteristic energy $h\nu_m$ and $h\nu_c$ at the detector are given by

$$h\nu_m = 2\times10^{-2}\mathrm{eV}(\frac{G}{60})^2(\frac{1-\beta\cos\theta_v}{0.1})^{-1}(\frac{\gamma}{20})^2(\frac{r}{r_0})^{-1}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{1/2}(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{1/2} \tag{8}$$

$$h\nu_c = 8.7\times10^{-3}\mathrm{eV}(\frac{1-\beta\cos\theta_v}{0.1})^{-1}(\frac{\gamma}{20})^{-2}(\frac{r}{r_0})(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{-3/2}(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{-3/2}(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{-2} \tag{9}$$

Now consider the observed radiation in optical and X-ray bands. I is evaluated for $\theta_v \sim 30^\circ$ and *fast cooling* case as

$$I = 2^{4+p/2}\frac{1}{\theta_v^{2+p}}(\frac{\Delta\theta}{\theta_v})^2 G^{p-1}(\frac{r}{r_0})^{1-p/2}\gamma^{p-2}F(\frac{\nu_0}{\nu})^{p/2}. \tag{10}$$

Then the energy flux in a band of $\nu_d < \nu < \nu_u$ is given by

$$F_b \equiv \int_{\nu_d}^{\nu_u} F_\nu d\nu = 1.74\times10^{-12}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}}C_p\frac{2}{p-2}((\frac{\nu_0}{\nu_d})^{p/2-1} - (\frac{\nu_0}{\nu_u})^{p/2-1})$$
$$(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{4-p}(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{2-p/2}(\frac{D}{40\mathrm{Mpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\theta_v}{30^\circ})^{-4}(2\frac{\Delta\theta}{\theta_v})^{4-p}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{p/2-1}T_d^{2-p}, \tag{11}$$

where $C_p = 2^{3(p-2)/2}12140^{(p-2)}(G/60)^{p-1}$ Let us compute F_b in X-ray band ($\nu_d = 1.6$keV, $\nu_u = 10$keV) and V band ($\nu_d = 5\times10^{14}$Hz, $\nu_u = 6\times10^{14}$Hz) for $p = 2.2$ and $p = 2.5$.

For $p = 2.2$

$$F_b = 6.5\times10^{-13}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}}(1.4\times10^{-13}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}};\ \text{V band})(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{1.8}$$
$$(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{0.95}(\frac{D}{40\mathrm{Mpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\theta_v}{30^\circ})^{-4}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^{1.2}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{0.05}(2\frac{\Delta\theta}{\theta_v})^{1.8}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{0.1}T_d^{-0.2}. \quad (12)$$

In this case the declining rate is almost the same as the observed value while the absolute value of the X-ray flux is similar to the observed one and can be adjusted by choosing the appropriate values of various parameters such as $\theta_v, \Delta\theta, \epsilon_e, \epsilon_B, r_0, n_0$ and E_b.

For p=2.5

$$F_b = 8.0\times10^{-13}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}}(3.0\times10^{-13}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}};\ \text{V band})(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{1.5}$$
$$(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{0.875}(\frac{D}{40\mathrm{Mpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\theta_v}{30^\circ})^{-4}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^{1.5}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{0.125}(2\frac{\Delta\theta}{\theta_v})^{1.5}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{0.25}T_d^{-0.5}. \quad (13)$$

In this case, the amplitude of the X-ray flux can be similar to the observed value but the decline rate is somewhat too rapid.

For comparison, we shall compute the energy flux for an aligned case ($\theta_v = 0$). Since in this case the position of the shock is related to the arrival time of the radiation by $r = 2\gamma^2 cT$, γ is given by

$$\gamma = 13(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{1/4}(\frac{\Delta\theta}{15^\circ})^{-1/2}(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{-1/4}(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{-1/2}T_d^{-1/4} \quad (14)$$

F_b is given for $p = 2.2$ as

$$F_b = 7.8\times10^{-11}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}}(1.7\times10^{-11}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}};\ \text{V band})(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{0.5}$$
$$(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{0.3}(\frac{D}{40\mathrm{Mpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\Delta\theta}{15^\circ})^{-1.6}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^{1.2}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{0.1}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{0.8}T_d^{-0.9}. \quad (15)$$

while for $p = 2.5$

$$F_b = 2.7\times10^{-11}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}}(1.7\times10^{-11}\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}\ cm^{-2}};\ \text{V band})(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})^{0.5}$$
$$(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{0.375}(\frac{D}{40\mathrm{Mpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\Delta\theta}{15^\circ})^{-1.75}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^{1.5}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{0.125}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{0.875}T_d^{-1.125}. \quad (16)$$

Let us apply Eq. (16) to GRB990123. There was a break in the optical light curve at $T_d = 2$. This may be due to the widening of the beaming half-angle (Rhoads 1997, Kulkarni *et al.* 1999). From the condition of $\gamma = \Delta\theta^{-1}$ at $T_d = 2$, $\Delta\theta$ is expressed by the other parameters as

$$\Delta\theta = 1.8^\circ(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\mathrm{erg}})^{-1/2}(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\mathrm{cm}})(\frac{n_0}{1\mathrm{cm}^{-3}})^{0.5} \quad (17)$$

Adopting D =10Gpc as the luminosity distance to GRB990123 ($z = 1.6$; Bloom *et al.* 1999a) we have

$$F_b = 1.8 \times 10^{-14}\text{erg s}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-2}(1.1 \times 10^{-14}\text{erg s}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-2};\ \text{ V band})(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\text{cm}})^{-1.125}$$
$$(\frac{n_0}{1\text{cm}^{-3}})^{-0.5}(\frac{D}{10\text{Gpc}})^{-2}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^{1.5}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.1})^{0.125}(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\text{erg}})^{1.75}T_d^{-1.125}. \quad (18)$$

For example, if $E_b \sim 10^{52}$erg with the other parameters unchanged, the decline rate and amplitude of the flux in X-ray and the optical bands are similar to the observed values. However even if $E_b \sim 10^{51}$erg, by appropriate choice of the other parameters such as r_0, n_0, ϵ_e and ϵ_B, we may also have the observed amplitude.

4. Discussion

Since a possible association of GRBs with Type Ib/Ic supernovae is suggested only for GRB980425, we had better wait for more events to confirm the conjecture. However recently another possible association of GRB with the supernova is suggested for GRB980326. The decline of the afterglow was leveled off at ∼20 days after the GRB, which was considered as the host galaxy. Keck observed the host galaxy nine months after the burst again but could not find the host galaxy. A possible explanation for this peculiar event is that the apparent level off at ∼20 days is due to the peak of supernova like SN1998bw(Bloom *et al.* 1999b). If this is the case, at least two examples of association of GRBs with supernovae exist.

For GRB980425 in our model the break in the light curve when $\gamma = \theta^{-1}$ should occur at

$$T_d = 544(\frac{E_b}{10^{51}\text{erg}})(\frac{\theta_v}{30^\circ})^2(\frac{n_0}{1\text{cm}^{-3}})^{-1}(\frac{r_0}{10^{17}\text{cm}})^{-2}. \quad (19)$$

The break time does not depend on $\Delta\theta$ but on E_b, θ_v, n_0 and r_0. Before the break time, Eq.(12) and (13) can be used so that the optical luminosity is much lower than the luminosity of SN1998bw for $T_d < 180$ (Iwamoto *et al.* 1998). However the decline rate is so low that the luminosity from the afterglow might overcome the luminosity of the supernova and the host galaxy before $T_d \sim 544$. Therefore it is important to observe SN1998bw up to ~ 2 years after the supernova event.

In conclusion, if the line of sight is $\sim 30^\circ$ away from the axis of the beam for GRB980425, the decline rate and the X-ray flux similar to the observed values are obtained for appropriate choice of the parameters. This strengthens the link between GRB980425 and SN1998bw.

This work was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid of Scientific Research of the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports, No.11640274 and 09NP0801.

REFERENCES

Bloom, J. S. *et al.* 1999, astro-ph/9902182

Bloom, J. S. *et al.* 1999, astro-ph/9905301

Eichler,D. & Levinson, A. 1998, astro-ph/9812113

Galama, T.J. *et al.* 1998, ,Nature, 395, 670

Granot,J., Piran, T. & Sari,R. 1998, astro-ph/9806192

Halpern,J. P. , Kemp,J., Piran, T. & Bershady, M. A. 1999, astro-ph/9903418

Hoeflich, P., Wheeler, J.C. & Wang, L. 1998, astro-ph/9808086

Iwamoto, K. *et al.* 1998, Nature, 395, 672

Kay, L. E., Halpern, J. P. & Leighly, K. M. ,1998, IAUC6969

Kulkarni, S.R. *et al.* 1998, Nature, 395, 663

Kulkarni, S.R. *et al.* 1999, astro-ph/9902272

Li, Z. Y. & Chevalier, R.A. 1999, astro-ph/9903483

Nakamura, T. 1998, Prog. Theor. Phys. , 100, 921

Pendelton, G. N.*et al.* 1997, ApJ, 489, 175

Meszaros, P., Rees, M. J. & Wijers, R. A. M. J., 1998, ApJ, 499, 301

Pian, E. *et al.* 1999, astro-ph/9903113

Piran, T. 1998, astro-ph/9810256 (Physics Reports in press) and references therein

Rhoads, J.E. 1997, ApJ, 478, L1

Sari, R. , Piran, T. & Narayan, R., 1998, ApJ, 497, L17

Woods, E. & Loeb, A. 1999, astro-ph/9903377

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v4.0.